

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
YOSHIKI ISHII) : Examiner: David N. Werner
Application No.: 10/705,938) : Group Art Unit: 2621
Filed: November 13, 2003) : Confirmation No. 6571
For: IMAGE PROCESSING)
APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR :
PROCESSING MOTION-PICTURE)
DATA AND STILL-IMAGE DATA : May 26, 2009

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Sir:

In response to the May 11, 2009 Interview Summary, requiring the filing of a Statement of Substance of Interview by Applicant, Applicant is filing this Statement of Substance of Interview. Applicant filed a summary of the substance of several telephone conversations with the May 4, 2009 Amendment. But that summary identified the dates of the conversations as April 29, 2009 and April 30, 2009, in accordance with the undersigned's records of those interviews. However, the May 11, 2009 Interview Summary lists a date of April 28, 2009 for an interview covering the topics discussed in the interview summary attached to the May 4, 2009 Amendment. To avoid any question as to whether Applicant has filed a summary of the substance of the interview discussed in the May 11, 2009 Interview Summary, Applicant is filing this statement of substance of interview to make of record the interview discussed in the May 11, 2009 Interview Summary.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the telephone conversation discussed in the May 11, 2009 Interview Summary. Applicant's representative discussed amending the claims to recite further features of the switch providing still-image data in place of motion picture data to overcome the rejection over the Rick et al. patent. The Examiner indicated that he did not believe such amendments would overcome the rejection over the Rick et al. patent. However, the Examiner indicated that he would withdraw the election of species requirement, and examine claims directed to the non-elected species. In addition, the Examiner indicated that based upon a cursory review, amending independent Claims 1, 15, and 28 to recite the resolution converting circuit shown in Figure 7 would likely overcome the rejection over the Rick et al. patent. In the event Applicant so amended the claims and such an amendment overcame the rejection over the Rick et al. patent, the Examiner stated that he would conduct an updated search.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs/

Gary M. Jacobs
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200